

**Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2008****Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:**

Alaska's FFY08 Annual Performance Report preparation was completed in conjunction with revisions State Performance Plan Report (SPP). The Alaska's Part C state staff worked closely with stakeholders including members of the Interagency Coordinating Council (ICC) Early Intervention Committee (EIC) as well as the Alaska Infant Learning Providers Association (AILPA) for both the FFY08 APR and SPP development and revisions.

Alaska's stakeholders assisted with development of baseline and target goals, provided review and feedback on strategies or targets, and recommended changes within the annual report and state performance plan.

The Office of Children's Services continues to improve the media outreach campaign to disseminate quality and compliance information for the Part C Early Intervention System (EIS) to the general public and the field. Local agency data became available on the Alaska Early Intervention/Infant Learning Program website for public review on compliance and quality indicators in 2007. The revised five-year State Performance Plan and related data are available on the Alaska Early Intervention web site at: <http://www.hss.state.ak.us/ocs/InfantLearning/default.htm>.

The FFY08 APR is based on Alaska's monitoring activities, 618 reporting and ongoing state level EI/ILP data review. The State of Alaska embarked on a large shift from cyclical to focused monitoring in FFY07. In conjunction with the University of Oregon, the State of Alaska Part C office revisited the function and process of the cyclical monitoring and refined the database to ensure timely identification and correction of negative trends in compliance or service quality data. This new system was piloted throughout FFY07. Full implementation of the new monitoring and data collection system occurred in FFY08. The new web-based data system was well received by Alaska's Early Intervention Program providers and allows the use of timely data directed technical assistance. Alaska is confident that these changes to the monitoring system demonstrate significant enhancements and continued compliance.

This change in the methodology of monitoring allows Alaska to increase available technical assistance to all local EI/ILP agencies in a timely and effective manner. In FFY09 Alaska anticipates only focused monitoring and technical assistance based on real time web based data.

All data in this report has been reviewed for accuracy and timeliness to ensure it is from the correct reporting time period, consistent with reporting requirements (including 618), follows the OSEP measurement tables and is consistent with previous data trends.

Alaska EI/ILP continued to partner with Child Protection Service (CPS) agencies across the state for improved referral process of infants and toddlers experiencing abuse and neglect. The result was a considerable increase in referrals from CPS in the past two years. As a result, EI/ILP is enhancing available Early Childhood Mental Health Services. Alaska Part C also continues to be an active presence on many statewide initiatives to increase awareness of Part C and other related early childhood services including: Alaska Early Childhood Comprehensive Systems initiative, the Assuring Better Child Development (ABCD) project, a new Interdepartmental Early Childhood Coordinating Council, Positive Behavioral Supports (PBS) Early Childhood committee, Alaska Mental Health Board, Early Childhood Mental Health regulations work group, Autism Alliance and the Autism Grant Steering Committee. Alaska Part C continues to be committed to improving services for all Alaskan infants and toddlers with or at risk of developmental delays and their families.

**Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments**

**Indicator 1:** Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A) and 1442)

**Measurement:**

Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner) divided by the (total # of infants and toddlers with IFSPs)] times 100.

**Applied:**

660 infants and toddlers with IFSPs received the early interventions services on their IFSPs in a timely manner;

763 total infants and toddlers with IFSPs

$660/763 \times 100 = 86.5\%$

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2008	100%

**Actual Target Data for FFY 2008:**

**86.5%**

These data are collected through Alaska's Part C database and include all children with IFSPs in the state during the reporting period (FFY 2008). Data reported in previous APRs for this indicator were collected on a sample of children through cyclical onsite monitoring.

Alaska Part C included 54 children for whom the state identified the cause for delay as exceptional family circumstances documented in the child's record in both the numerator and denominator for this indicator.

Alaska Part C collected data on the number of days late and delay reasons for each child that did not receive timely services in its Part C database. Alaska defines timely services as those "IFSP services initiated on or before the IFSP initiation date as established by the IFSP team, including parents".

Table of Range of Days Late (excludes family delays)

FY 09 103 Children	Number of children	Percent of children
1 to 7 Days	31	30.1%
8 to 30 Days	26	25.2%
31 to 90 Days	18	17.5%
> 90 Days	7	6.8%
Missing contact data	21	20.4%
FY 09 Total	103	100.0%

**Correction of Noncompliance with Indicator 1:**

Year	Number of Findings Made	Number of Findings Timely Corrected (within 12 months)	Number of Findings Subsequently Corrected	Number of Remaining Findings
FFY 2006	4	3	1	0
FFY 2007	4	4	NA	0
FFY 2008	7	To be reported in the FFY09 APR	To be reported in the FFY09 APR	To be reported in the FFY09 APR

Alaska Part C identified noncompliance in FFY 2006 and FFY 2007 through cyclical onsite monitoring. For FFY 2008 and beyond, Alaska Part C reports on findings identified through analysis of annual census data collected by its Part C database.

As reported in the FFY 2007 APR, one finding of noncompliance made in FFY 2006 remained uncorrected. Alaska Part C imposed the following sanctions on the one EIS program with uncorrected noncompliance: required technical assistance; monthly reporting; and additional onsite monitoring to conduct a root cause analysis, including the identification of noncompliance with related requirements. This agency has subsequently corrected and achieved 100% indicator 1 compliance.

Consistent with the OSEP 09-02 Memo, Alaska Part C verified that each EIS program corrected noncompliance by reviewing data demonstrating that the program was correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements. Alaska Part C verified this through reviewing data from its Part C database showing that each EIS program provided timely services for 100% of children with IFSPs for at least one quarter following the implementation of a corrective action plan.

In addition, using child-level data in its Part C database, Alaska Part C state staff verified that each child who did not receive timely services did receive the services on his or her IFSP, although late, unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of Alaska Part C, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. For the 103 children with late IFSP services or missing contact data, Alaska Part C staff examined each child record for documentation accuracy, reviewed regulations and requirements for timely services with each EIS agency and sent correspondence regarding family rights to families with missing IFSP service contact data.

**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2008:**

FFY08 actual performance target of 85.58% is below the state projected target of 100%. Actual FFY 2008 data demonstrate improvement from 54% (FFY 2007) to 86.5% (FFY 2008). It is important to note that FFY 2007 data was collected through cyclical on-site monitoring compare with statewide census data for FFY 2008. Alaska continues to demonstrate indicator 1 improvement with 92.74% compliance in FFY 2009 first quarter.

Alaska completed the following improvement activities in FFY08:

- Database training to improve service documentation including: contact coding and indicator 1 state definition clarification, use of database notation fields to document all extenuating circumstances related to late services.
- Development and implementation of new administrative reports allowing local EIS program staff to generate reminders, calendars and data compliance reports to track upcoming services due and staff case loads.
- Training and Implementation of Primary Coaching Model to maximize pediatric therapy resources for interested local EI programs.

- COSF study initiated to ensure that resource allocation allows all children to receive the services needed as stated on the IFSP. A task force will be convened to examine disparity of service issues within the state upon completion of COSF study.
- Finalized implementation of recruitment and retention plan created with key stakeholders, providers, and state staff.
- State EI/ILP staff engaged in continued oversight of the delivery of timely services that will include data review on a quarterly and yearly basis in addition to piloting a focused monitoring system. Implementation of monthly reporting for local EIS programs with longstanding noncompliance.
- Quarterly statewide data teleconferences held addressing ongoing issues or disseminating data trend information across local programs as needed.
- Local programs continued to provide quarterly improvement and correction plans to state EI/ILP staff on data or compliance issues responding to on-site monitor information.

Indicator 1 Progress Table					
<i>Measurable and Rigorous Target 2008-2009</i>	Baseline FFY04 2004-2005	Actual Data FFY05 2005-2006	Actual Data FFY06 2006-2007	Actual Data FFY07 2007-2008	Actual Data FFY08 2008-2009
100%	<b>85%</b>	<b>84%</b>	<b>84%</b>	<b>54%</b>	<b>86.5%</b>

Note: Alaska Part C identified noncompliance in FFY 2006 and FFY 2007 through cyclical onsite monitoring. For FFY 2008, Alaska Part C reflects findings identified through analysis of census data collected by its Part C database.

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2009:**

Changes to the Alaska SPP 2009 and 2010 Indicator 1 improvement activities and measurement:

<b>Original SPP 2009-2010 Improvement Activity</b>	<b>Proposed Improvement Activity Change</b>	<b>Justification for Improvement Activity Change</b>
2009 Local programs will continue to provide QIPs to state EI/ILP staff on data or compliance issues in a timely manner as they respond to on-site monitor information.	Local programs will submit quarterly progress on Corrective Action Plans to state EI/ILP staff for compliance issues (indicators below 100%). Corrective Action Plans replace the former Quality Improvement Plans (QIP).	Corrective Action Plans align with Alaska's new focused monitoring system and promote root cause analysis of indicators below 100% targets.
2009 State EI/ILP staff will engage in continued oversight of the delivery of timely services that will include data review on a quarterly and yearly basis in addition to our on-site cyclical monitoring capability. Quarterly data teleconferences with all programs will	Alaska implemented a census based, focused monitoring system in FFY 2008; discontinuing its cyclical monitoring system. State staff will continue	A focused monitoring system including monthly reporting for EIS programs with longstanding noncompliance allows Alaska state staff to identify systemic and local EIS program problems in a timely manner, providing

## APR Template – Part C (4)

Alaska

State

allow us to address ongoing issues or disseminate data trend information across local programs as needed.	oversight of the delivery of timely services through its focused monitoring system. Local EIS programs with longstanding noncompliance will report progress to state staff on a monthly basis.	expedient technical assistance and oversight of improvement planning.
2010 State EI/ILP staff will engage in continued oversight of the delivery of timely services that will include data review on a quarterly and yearly basis in addition to our on-site cyclical monitoring capability.	State EI/ILP staff will engage in continued oversight of the delivery of timely services that will include data review on a quarterly and yearly basis in addition to our monitoring capability.	Alaska replaced a cyclical on-site monitoring system with an annual focused monitoring system in FFY08.

**Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY08****Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:**

This overview process is the same as described for Indicator 1.

**Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments**

**Indicator 2:** Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A) and 1442)

**Measurement:** Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings) divided by the (total # of infants and toddlers with IFSPs)] times 100.

**Applied:**

552 Infants and toddlers enrolled with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings  
576 of infants and toddlers with IFSPs  
 $552/576 \times 100 = 95.83\%$

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2008	95%

**Actual Target Data for 2008:**

**95.83%**

These data are collected through Alaska's Part C database and include all children enrolled with IFSPs in the state on December 1, 2008. This is the same data reported under Section 618. Alaska's actual target slightly exceeds the state measurable target of 95%.

**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2008:**

Alaska's data system incorporates user reports that aid local EIS and state EI staff monitors the provision of services in the natural environment. Alaska's monitoring system ensures that services not held in the natural environment are settings determined most appropriate to meet the needs of the child.

Indicator 2 Progress Table					
Measurable and Rigorous Target 2007-2008	Baseline FFY04 2004-2005	Actual Data FFY05 2005-2006	Actual Data FFY06 2006-2007	Actual Data FFY07 2007-2008	Actual Data FFY08 2008-2009
95%	<b>93.4%</b>	<b>94.5%</b>	<b>95.1%</b>	<b>95.8%</b>	<b>95.8%</b>

Alaska completed the following improvement activities in FFY08:

- State EI/ILP staff provided technical assistance with the development of Corrective Action Plans based on review of monitoring data.
- Training and technical assistance were provided to local EIS programs with indicator 2 CAP strategies.
- State EI/ILP staff reviewed local EIS data to ensure compliance.
- Key stakeholders reviewed trend data and provided feedback on strategies or changes needed to improve delivery of services in the natural environment.

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY2009:**

Changes to the Alaska SPP 2009-2010 Indicator 2 improvement activities and measurement:

Original SPP 2009 Improvement Activity	Proposed Improvement Activity Change	Justification for Improvement Activity Change
2009 State EI/ILP staff will continue to work with each program on QIPs, based on on-site monitor review data as well as the use and review of quarterly and year end data, to ensure compliance between cyclical on-site monitoring.	State EI/ILP staff will provide technical assistance and monitoring oversight of each EIS program assisting with Corrective Action Plan development to ensure indicator compliance.	Corrective Action Plans align with Alaska's new focused monitoring system and promote root cause analysis of indicators below 95% targets.
2009 SPP Measurement changed from: Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or programs for typically developing children) divided by the (total # of infants and toddlers with IFSPs)] times 100.	Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings) divided by the (total # of infants and toddlers with IFSPs)] times 100.	This measurement change reflects current Part C SPP/APR Indicator /Measurement Table measurement language.
2010 State EI/ILP staff will continue to work with each program on QIPs, based on on-site monitor review data as well as the use and review of quarterly and year end data, to ensure compliance between cyclical on-site monitoring.	State EI/ILP staff will provide technical assistance and monitoring oversight of each EIS program assisting with Corrective Action Plan development to ensure indicator compliance.	Corrective Action Plans align with Alaska's new focused monitoring system and promote root cause analysis of indicators below 95% targets.

**Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY08****Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:**

This overview process is the same as described for Indicator 1.

**Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments**

**Indicator 3:** Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who demonstrate improved:

- A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);
- B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication); and
- C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A) and 1442)

**Measurement:**

Outcomes:

- A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);
- B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication); and
- C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

Progress categories for A, B and C:

- a. Percent of infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning =  $\left[ \frac{\text{\# of infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning}}{\text{\# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed}} \right]$  times 100.
- b. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers =  $\left[ \frac{\text{\# of infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers}}{\text{\# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed}} \right]$  times 100.
- c. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it =  $\left[ \frac{\text{\# of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it}}{\text{\# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed}} \right]$  times 100.
- d. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers =  $\left[ \frac{\text{\# of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers}}{\text{\# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed}} \right]$  times 100.
- e. Percent of infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers =  $\left[ \frac{\text{\# of infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers}}{\text{\# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed}} \right]$  times 100.

**Summary Statements for Each of the Three Outcomes (use for FFY 2008-2009 reporting):**

**Summary Statement 1:** Of those infants and toddlers who entered or exited early intervention below age expectations in each Outcome, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program.

**Measurement for Summary Statement 1:**

Percent =  $\frac{\text{\# of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (c) plus \# of infants and toddlers}}$



reported in category (d) divided by [# of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (a) plus # of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (b) plus # of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (c) plus # of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (d)] times 100.

**Summary Statement 2:** The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in each Outcome by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program.

**Measurement for Summary Statement 2:** Percent = # of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (d) plus [# of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (e) divided by the total # of infants and toddlers reported in progress categories (a) + (b) + (c) + (d) + (e)] times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2008	Targets are set for FFY2009

### Overview of Issues/Description of System or Process:

The development of the child outcome measurement system for Alaska began in March 2005 by the Alaska GSEG Infant and Toddler workgroup. This workgroup consisted of parents from the Early Intervention Committee, providers serving Part C children, and state Part C staff. A task force was formed to continue the work of the Infant and Toddler workgroup. The task force completed the policies and procedures of the outcome measurement system by February of 2006 so that training of service providers and administrators could occur in March and piloting and preliminary data collection could begin in April.

In November 2006 staff from seven local agencies that piloted the Child Outcomes Summary Form (COSF) in Alaska met with state Part C staff and Eco Center staff to evaluate the COSF process and to plan and make recommendations for statewide training. Part C local agency staff received training on the COSF process on February 19-20, 2007. The training was conducted by Kathleen Hebbeler and Lynne Kahn from the ECO Center, and included state guidance on timelines for implementation and COSF data entry in the state data system. A notebook with ECO Center materials and state specific instructions for the COSF process was given to each participant.

Statewide implementation of the COSF in local programs began on March 1, 2007. However, changes in local agency processes required additional time and support over the next several months before all staff were able to implement the COSF consistently at enrollment and exit for all Part C children. Monthly teleconferences with local program coordinators provided opportunities for feedback and discussion of local questions and challenges.

Videotapes of the February 2007 training sessions were used to develop a set of training modules that were distributed with accompanying printed materials to each local agency in November 2007 for the purpose of consistent training for new staff as well as regular review and training updates for all staff involved in completing the COSF process. The modules are designed for self-guided individual use or as a tool for larger training sessions conducted by a state or local trainer.

COSF data entered in the state EI/ILP database includes individual child ratings in the three outcome areas as well as the COSF completion date, members of the COSF team, sources of information and assessment tools used for making each COSF rating. The EI/ILP database was converted to an online system in July 2007. A report using the ECO Center's COSF to OSEP Categories Calculator has been built into the state web-based data system and is used to review child outcome progress data for each agency and statewide quarterly and annually.

*Policies and procedures to guide child outcome assessment and measurement practices*

All children who enter the EI/ILP system after 4/1/06 and who will be enrolled for at least six months (enter prior to age 2½ years) will be assessed at least twice using the procedures to be developed by the outcome measurement task force, based on the recommendations from the Early Childhood Outcome (ECO) Center. The following preliminary decisions have been made about the measurement system:

- Assessments will include input from more than one source and will include input from the child's family.
- Assessments will be summarized to provide a "score", similar to the one developed by the ECO Center.
- Specific assessments will not be required; a list of recommended assessments will be developed.
- Children will be assessed fairly close to the time of entry into the EI/ILP system and fairly close to their exit from the system so that the amount of developmental progress can be accurately represented in pre- and post- ratings.
- Data from the summary "score" will be entered into the EI/ILP data system at least twice for each child who is enrolled for over six months, so the data system can be used to determine the progress a child has made.
- The EI/ILP data manual will be updated to describe directions on how to record the data for the outcome measurement.

The outcome system is now included in the state's monitoring process. The data reported are evaluated for accuracy and timeliness. The EI/ILP database has built-in edit checks to prevent knowable errors (dates, scores, missing data).

When the data are analyzed, reports are produced by the state describing the results of the measurement system. Programs with unexpected results are contacted by the state staff to determine the reason and an appropriate corrective action.

Alaska utilizes the following definition for 'comparable to same age peers':

Child shows functioning expected for his or her age in all or almost all everyday situations. Functioning is considered appropriate for his or her age. The child's age level scores as measured on one of the selected anchor assessment tools can be a useful source of information, but should be used in conjunction with other information about the child. A standardized testing situation is an unusual setting for a young child. Therefore, if the child's functioning in a testing situation differs from the child's everyday functioning, the rating should reflect the child's everyday functioning.

Access to the EI/ILP data system is limited to specified state and local program staff.

The data fields related to this measurement system are incorporated into the current EI/ILP database for the least amount of impact possible on program staff while considering the most effective means of data quality.

Each of the programs has a number of standard reports related to the outcome measurement system to help with tracking, viewing and reporting their outcome data. Statewide analysis is completed by the state staff as required and at least annually.

**Actual Baseline Data for 2008:****Progress Data for Infants and Toddlers Exiting 2008-2009**

A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships):	# of children	% of children
a) Percent of infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	5	2.05%
b) Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	46	18.85%
c) Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach	51	20.90%
d) Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	53	21.72%
e) Percent of infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	89	36.48%
Total	N = 244	100%
B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication):	# of children	% of children
a) Percent of infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	3	1.23%
b) Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	39	15.98%
c) Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach	63	25.82%
d) Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	83	34.02%
e) Percent of infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	56	22.95%
Total	N = 244	100%
C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs:	# of children	% of children
a) Percent of infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	6	2.46%
b) Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	46	18.85%
c) Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach	58	23.77%
d) Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	85	34.84%
e) Percent of infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	49	20.08%
Total	N = 244	100%

**Summary Statement Baseline Data for Infants and Toddlers Exiting 2008-2009:**

Summary Statements	% of children
<b>Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)</b>	
1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	67.10%
2. The percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	58.20%

Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy)	
1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	77.66%
2. The percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	56.97%
Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	
1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	73.33%
2. The percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	54.92%

**Discussion of Baseline Data:**

Progress data reported in 2010 will be considered baseline data. Because of the limited number (51) of COSFs completed during the pilot phase and the fact that statewide COSF data collection began with initial ratings on children enrolled in March 2007, the number of progress ratings reported in the FFY2006 APR was extremely low (n=11). In FFY2007, child outcome data for 90 children was complete and reported in the APR. For FFY2008, the number of children with outcome data increased to 244, and the number is expected to increase to over 400 children in the FFY2009, as still more children exit the program with initial ratings completed after the COSF was first implemented in March, 2007.

The following data analysis reports have been developed and refined to promote and monitor improvement in data quality and accuracy:

- DCR2 (Data Compliance Report-2) – tracks quarterly progress in completing COSF at both enrollment and exit for children who are exiting the program. Business rules allow adjustment when data is missing or untimely for justifiable reasons. This report shows local agency trends for the number of children exiting with COSF data over the 4 previous quarters. It also lists the children exiting with missing or late COSF data so that program coordinators can drill down and see their compliance or data cleaning issues and make corrections before submitting verified quarterly reports to the state office.
- Quarterly Narrative Report - developed in FFY2007 for local agencies to report on progress or slippage on selected performance indicators was refined to include more detailed COSF data for children exited each quarter. Analysis and written explanation is required for any exited children without an initial and/or exit COSF. This report includes local improvement plans and informs state staff about technical assistance needs at the regional program level.
- Reminders Report – gives providers advance notice of missing COSF data for newly enrolled and exiting children and shows dates that these ratings are due. The report is used at the local level for planning purposes and by state staff to identify technical assistance needs.
- COSF No Progress Report – provides a list of children falling into OSEP category “a” and helps to identify where providers may need additional training on how to answer the COSF question, “Did the child make any progress?” This year coding has also been added to the database to automate the field for the progress question when initial and exit ratings logically require the child to have made progress. This

improvement has lessened the need for the COSF No Progress Report because database users automatically receive an error message if progress data is entered incorrectly.

- **Child Outcome Summary Report** – gives a summary of the initial and exit ratings completed for all children exiting the program in a selected year. This report uses the ECO Center calculations to generate the data required for Indicator 3 reporting each year for the five OSEP measures for each of the three outcome areas and calculates the percentages for the two summary statements under each of the three outcome areas. Sections have recently been added to this report to show trends in the summary statement data over a three year period and tables and charts that allow comparison and groupings of regional data from across the state, with the capability to sort individual child data at the local level by the five OSEP categories for each outcome.

All of these data system reports have been valuable tools to improve understanding and analysis of the child outcome data. Alaska has also participated regularly in the ECO Center Community of Practice calls and state staff presented at a session during the national EC Outcomes Conference in 2009. This presentation was repeated during a teleconference several weeks later.

The baseline data should be viewed with some caution due to the following considerations. The 244 children with complete COSF data for FFY2008 may not be representative of all children exiting the program during the year. There are still a number of children exiting the program who were enrolled prior to March 2007, so initial ratings on these children were not available and they could not be included in the data set. Because these children were enrolled at an earlier age and also for a longer duration than those children who are included in the data set, they are quite likely to have different characteristics that may influence the outcome data.

In addition, provider teams who completed the initial ratings for many of the children in the baseline data set were very new to the process and quality of the initial rating data may have been inconsistent as providers were learning the process. Quality assurance activities over the past two years have helped to improve data quality, so Alaska expects to see more accurate child outcome rating data in coming years.

### Measurable and Rigorous Target:

**Targets for Infants and Toddlers Exiting in FFY2009 (7/2009-6/2010) and FFY 2010 (7/2010-6/2011) and Reported in February 2011 and February 2012**

Summary Statements	Targets for FFY 2009 (% of children)	Targets for FFY 2010 (% of children)
<b>Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)</b>		
1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	60%	68%
2. The percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	52%	59%
<b>Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy)</b>		
1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age	66%	78%

## SPP Template – Part C (4)

Alaska  
State

expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program		
2. The percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	46%	57%
Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs		
1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	62%	74%
2. The percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	46%	55%

### Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of the State's analysis of data for the purpose of increasing data quality:

#### *Discussion of proposed targets and target setting activities*

The above target percentages have been set based on analysis of existing data, using the data reports described above. Characteristics of children in the baseline data set were considered and local program data was examined to determine the possible impact of outliers on the statewide data. It was determined that the few local programs with either extremely low percentages or extremely high percentages on the two outcome statements in each of the outcome areas did not have a significant impact on statewide percentages due to the very small number of exiting children in these programs. In fact, because of the very small numbers in several of these rural programs, no meaning could be applied to these local summary percentages other than probable effect of individual child characteristics influencing their progress ratings.

As of January 2010, outcome data is already available for nearly 200 children exited in the first half of FFY2009. The summary statement percentages for this cohort are considerably lower than summary statement percentages reported for FFY2008 as baseline. These new percentages represent almost half of the anticipated FFY2009 cohort of exiting children and were used to project targets for the 2011 (FFY2009) report.

Current year baseline percentages are considered a rigorous and ambitious target for 2012. Alaska suspects that baseline percentages are higher than we may expect for future years due to the fact that very few of the children with outcome data reported in 2010 were enrolled in the program before one year of age, and therefore might be expected to have less significant impairments that might impede their progress and lower their COSF ratings. Based on preliminary statistical analyses, it appears that several factors may have a negative impact on child outcome data, including certain diagnoses, and greater levels of delay at initial evaluation. More in-depth analysis is needed to ascertain the actual impact of such factors on child outcomes. For these reasons along with the significantly lower percentages calculated on preliminary data reported for FFY2009, Alaska expects to look closely at data trends, population and program characteristics that may impact outcome data in the coming year.

***Ongoing Improvement Activities***

- Database reports continue to be developed and refined to improve COSF data management and analysis capabilities at the state and local level.
- State staff and other stakeholders continue active participation in ECO Center training and teleconferences.
- The state has a service agreement with the University Center for Excellence in Developmental Disabilities at University of Alaska to assist with analysis of the statewide COSF data.
- ECO Center Powerpoint presentations have been adapted to include Alaska data charts and to train local program coordinators and other stakeholders on the process of data analysis for target setting.
- Stakeholder input on issues related to target setting is gathered during statewide presentations and discussions.
- Training on the COSF process is provided jointly for Part C and 619 local agency staff at the annual statewide special education conference (ASSEC) each year. This promotes collaboration and consistency of child outcome measurement across the two programs.
- On-site record reviews by state technical assistance staff continue to be conducted to assure consistency and accuracy of COSF data and to provide specific feedback and ongoing training and technical assistance for local providers.
- Alaska has been accepted as one of two TACSEI partner states in 2010-2012. This means that early intervention providers and care givers will receive in depth training and coaching on evidence-based practices to promote the social-emotional development of young children. It is anticipated that the improved practices resulting from this training will lead to increases in the number of children who make significant progress and/or attain functional skills comparable to age level peers by the time they exit the Part C program.

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY2009:**

Targets, improvement activities, timelines and resources were not previously required for indicator 3. This entire APR section (indicator 3) has been added to the SPP to reflect current activities and the newly required/established improvement activities and targets set in FFY08.

**Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY08****Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:**

This overview process is the same as described for Indicator 1.

**Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments**

**Indicator 4:** Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family:

- A. Know their rights;
- B. Effectively communicate their children's needs; and
- C. Help their children develop and learn.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A) and 1442)

**Measurement:**

- A. Percent = [(# of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights) divided by the (# of respondent families participating in Part C)] times 100.
- B. Percent = [(# of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs) divided by the (# of respondent families participating in Part C)] times 100.
- C. Percent = [(# of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn) divided by the (# of respondent families participating in Part C)] times 100.

**Applied:**

- A. 55 respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights  
62 respondent families participating in Part C  
 $55/62 \times 100 = 88.7\%$
- B. 57 respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs  
62 respondent families participating in Part C  
 $57/62 \times 100 = 91.9\%$
- C. 54 respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn  
61 respondent families participating in Part C  
 $54/61 \times 100 = 88.5\%$

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target	
2008	A. Know their rights;	100%
	B. Effectively communicate their children's needs;	100%
	C. Help their children develop and learn.	100%

**Actual Target Data for 2008:**



- A. Percent of responding families who indicated EI has done an excellent job helping them know their rights all or most of the time:  
88.7%
- B. Percent of responding families who indicated EI had done an excellent job helping them effectively communicate their children's needs all or most of the time:  
91.9%
- C. Percent of responding families who indicated EI helped them to help their children develop and learn all or most of the time:  
88.5%

Data for this indicator is the result of a statewide family outcomes survey conducted by a third-party evaluator, the University of Alaska Anchorage Center for Human Development (CHD). CHD was contracted to implement the FFY 2008 survey of families with children who had received EI/ILP services from January 1 to December 31, 2008. The methodology of the FFY 2008 Family Outcomes Survey utilized a randomly selected target group, stratified geographically (by ILP grantee).

#### **Representativeness of the Response Group**

In the FFY 2007 APR, Alaska reported that Native Americans were underrepresented in the FFY 2007 response group. To address this problem, Alaska revised its sampling plan for indicator 4 outcome survey following approval by OSEP in Feb. 2008. As approved by OSEP, the survey protocol utilized a revision of the scale first used in FFY 2007, simplifying some wording, resolving compound items, and adding new items. The protocol used the same 4-point Likert scale recommended for improved cultural appropriateness for Alaska's indigenous populations. Families were asked to rate experiences with their children and EI/ILP on 21 statements by choosing how often each statement was true for their family: none of the time, some of the time, most of the time, or all of the time.

A target group of 120 families was randomly selected from those including at least one child who not only received services in 2008, but was also eligible for Part C and had been enrolled in the program for at least 6 months. The survey and letter of introduction were mailed to the target group of families, inviting them to complete the survey by mail, online, or over the phone. There were 62 completed surveys rendering a 52% response rate.

Characteristics of responding families were compared with the randomly selected target group and the total eligible population of service recipients. Similarity across all three lent increased confidence that as a group, responders could be considered representative of all eligible families receiving ILP services during 2008. Though the target group of families was not stratified by race/ethnicity, there was no indication of an under-representation of families with Native children as there had appeared to be in previous survey years.

#### **Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2008:**

Progress or slippage cannot be determined for this indicator because the survey protocol and methodology for FFY 2007 and FFY 2008 were revised to ensure a more representative respondent group and to improve the response rate. As noted above, it appears that the revisions were successful.

It can be concluded from the results of the 2009 survey that there was an overall high level of satisfaction with the EI/ILP services from families receiving Part C services.

The greatest strengths identified from the survey were parental understanding of children, community access, and satisfaction with ILP services. Regarding rights and advocacy, there was some indication of improvement from the previous year, especially informing parents about rights and services.

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2008:** There are no changes to this indicator measurement, improvement activities, timelines, or resources.

**Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY08****Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:**

This overview process is the same as described for Indicator 1.

**Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find**

**Indicator 5:** Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs compared to national data.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

**Measurement:** Percent = [(# of infants and toddler birth to 1 with IFSPs) divided by the (population of infants and toddlers birth to 1)] times 100 compared to national data.

**Applied:**

113 infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs

11,127 Alaska population of infants and toddlers birth to 1

$113/11,127 \times 100 = 1.02\%$

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2008	1.2%

**Actual Target Data for 2008: 1.02%**

These data are collected through Alaska's Part C database and include all children enrolled with IFSPs in the state on December 1, 2008. This is the same data reported under Section 618. Alaska's actual target 1.02% is below the state measurable target of 1.2%.

EI/ILP strives to provide services to all infants and toddlers with developmental delays and or disabilities who qualify for services. Alaska defines Part C eligible children as those children who experience a significant developmental delay (at or greater than 50% in one or more developmental domains: cognitive, physical, communication, social/emotional, or adaptive) or those children who have an identified condition that would result in a significant delays. Overall, 43% of all enrolled children in FFY08 were under the age of one.

**Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs compared to National data**

Alaska's percent of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPS, under IDEA, Part C is nearly the same (1.02%) as the national average (1.04%) point-in-time December 1, 2008.

Percent of infants and toddlers receiving early intervention services under IDEA, Part C, by Alaska compared to National Part C: 2008			
National and State	Number served Birth to 1 yr.	Number Birth to 1 yr. Population	Percentage Birth to 1 yr. Population
Alaska	113	11,127	1.02%
National	45,166	4,359,268	1.04%

Sources: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education Programs, Data Analysis System (DANS), OMB #1820-0557: "Infants

**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY2008:**

While Alaska demonstrates slight slippage from FFY07 to FFY08, 1.02% is an overall increase for the past five years. This is below the target of 1.2%.

Indicator 5 Progress Table Age Enrolled - Birth to One				
Baseline FFY04 2004-2005	Actual Data FFY05 2005-2006	Actual Data FFY06 2006-2007	Actual Data FFY07 2007-2008	Actual Data FFY08 2008-2009
0.8%	0.93%	0.76%	1.14%	1.02%

Alaska completed the following improvement activities in FFY08:

- Plans for local outreach were developed based on the local provider needs, resources, and evidence of effective child find and incorporated into CAPs as needed.
- State EI/ILP staff reviewed year end data with each program to review numbers of children enrolled and strategies to increase enrollment for infants and their families in need of services.
- Public awareness materials were revised and distributed statewide to ensure that program information is disseminated in a variety of ways including: program participation in health fairs, state wide conferences, brochures, parent mail outs, and web-based.
- State EI/ILP staff provided technical assistance to local EIS programs for corrective action planning, based on monitor data, as well as the use and review of quarterly and year end data to ensure compliance.

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY2009:**

Changes to the Alaska SPP 2009 Indicator 5 improvement activities:

## APR Template – Part C (4)

Alaska

State

Original SPP 2009 Improvement Activity	Proposed Improvement Activity Change	Justification for Improvement Activity Change
State EI/ILP staff will continue to work with each program on QIPs, based on on-site monitor review data, as well as the use and review of quarterly and year end data to ensure compliance between cyclical on-site monitoring.	State EI/ILP staff will provide technical assistance and monitoring oversight of each EIS program assisting with Corrective Action Plan development to ensure indicator compliance.	Corrective Action Plans align with Alaska's new focused monitoring system and promote root cause analysis of indicators below 100% targets.

## Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY08

## Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

This overview process is the same as described for Indicator 1.

## Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

**Indicator 6:** Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs compared to national data.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

**Measurement:** Percent = [(# of infants and toddler birth to 3 with IFSPs) divided by the (population of infants and toddlers birth to 3)] times 100 compared to national data.

**Applied:**

576 infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs

32,215 Alaska population of infants and toddlers birth to 3

$576/32,215 * 100 = 1.79\%$

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2008	2.4%

**Actual Target Data for 2008: 1.79%**

These data are collected through Alaska's Part C database and include all children enrolled with IFSPs in the state on December 1, 2008. This is the same data reported under Section 618. Alaska's actual target 1.79% is below the state measurable target of 2.4%.

## A. Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs compared to National data

Alaska's percent of infants and toddlers receiving early intervention services under IDEA, Part C is below (1.79%) the national average (2.66%) of the birth to three year old population, point-in-time December 1, 2008.

The data for this indicator are the same data collected on Table 1 of Information Collection 1820-0557.

Percent of infants and toddlers receiving early intervention services under IDEA, Part C, by Alaska compared to National Part C: 2008			
National and State	Number served Birth to 3 yr.	Number Birth to 3 yr. Population	Percentage Birth to 3 yr. Population
Alaska	576	32,215	1.79%
National	342,544	12,901,038	2.66%

Sources: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education Programs, Data Analysis System (DANS), OMB #1820-0557: "Infants

**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY08:**

EI/ILP strives to provide services to all infants and toddlers with developmental delays and or disabilities who qualify for services. Alaska defines Part C eligible children as those children who experience a significant developmental delay (at or greater than 50% in one or more developmental domains: cognitive, physical, communication, social/emotional, or adaptive) or those children who have an identified condition that would result in a significant delays.

Indicator 6 Progress Table Birth to Three Percent of Population and Actual December 1 Enrollment					
	Baseline FFY04 2004-2005	Percent and Actual Data FFY05 2005-2006	Percent and Actual Data FFY06 2006-2007	Percent and Actual Data FFY07 2007-2008	Percent and Actual Data FFY08 2008-2009
Birth to Three Percent of Population	2.0%	2.09%	1.96%	1.94%	1.79%
Actual December 1 Enrollment	610	642	595	620	576
Birth to Three Population	30,262	30,101	30,328	31,502	32,215

While the December 1, 2008, point-in-time sample points to a decrease in percent of population served, ILP records show that Alaska, realized an overall increase of annual Part C enrollments for the year, most notably as a result of CAPTA.

<b>Enrollment Trends</b>	FFY05	FFY06	FFY07	FFY08
Total annual Part C enrollment	1350	1308	1406	1458

The University of Alaska, Center for Human Development conducted an impact study of the Child Abuse Prevention Treatment Act (CAPTA) on Alaska's Early Intervention Infant Learning Program (ILP) over a 4-year period. According to this study, CAPTA is "changing the overall population of children screened for Alaska ILP services, increasing involvement with children experiencing primary difficulties in an emotional domain" ". R.R. Lamar (2008), *Alaska's Early Intervention/Infant Learning Program; The Impact of CAPTA FY06 – FY08*, Anchorage

In FFY06 and 07, Alaska focused on improving referrals of children as required by CAPTA. This resulted in a 295% increase from FFY04 to FFY07 in the number of referrals from Child Protective Services (CPS). Increasing referrals from child protective services (CPS) resulted in increasing ILP enrollments as indicated in the chart above. These enrollees expanded overall ILP enrollment through FFY06 and FFY07 data indicates that their length of enrollment over the period tended to be shorter than other Part C enrollees. This trend apparently carried over but became less evident in the early part of FY08. As the trend slowed the number of enrollees exiting was not replaced resulting in lower overall enrollment totals for FY08. Currently, the indication is that length of enrollment for children referred from CPS more closely matches other Part C eligible children. . FFY09, December 1<sup>st</sup>, data supports an increase in overall enrollment.

Federal Fiscal Year	All Referrals (% increase)	CPS Referrals (% increase)	CPS % of All Referrals	CPS enrolled in ILP (% increase)
2004 (baseline)	1,864	205	11%	46
2005	2,727 (46%)	386 (88%)	14%	63 (37%)
2006	2,986 (60%)	602 (194%)	20%	125 (172%)
2007	2,930 (57%)	630 (207%)	22%	107 (133%)
FFY 04 - 07 Totals	8,643	1,618	19%	295
FFY08*	2791	575	21%	84

Note: the original CAPTA evaluation report collected FFY08 data through mid-September. This table includes all data for FFY08. Source: R.R. Lamar (2008), *Alaska's Early Intervention/Infant Learning Program; The Impact of CAPTA FY06 – FY08*, Anchorage.

Alaska completed the following improvement activities in FFY08:

- Alaska local EIS Programs submitted annual child find plans for regional outreach. Alaska's new monitoring system requires local EIS programs to report child find activities. Referral and enrollment rates are reviewed quarterly by state EI staff.
- Alaska Part C reviewed options for statewide universal screening with a broad stakeholder group and began initial planning activities for implementation in FFY 2009.
- State EI/ILP staff reviewed year-end data with each local EIS program. Numbers of children enrolled and strategies to increase enrollment for infants in need of services and their families are identified and implemented. Annual corrective action plans incorporate child find goals as necessary.
- Public awareness strategies were evaluated to ensure that program information is disseminated in a variety of ways including: program participation in health fairs, state wide conferences, brochures, parent mail outs, and web-based. New EIS program brochures and posters were developed and distributed statewide.
- State EI/ILP reviewed indicator targets with the ICC and provider organization to identify potential strategies of improvement or to review targets, however, indicator 6 review was postponed until FFY09.

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY2009:**

Changes to the Alaska SPP 2009 Indicator 6 improvement activities:

Original SPP Improvement Activity	Proposed Improvement Activity Change	Justification for Improvement Activity Change
Move improvement activity from FFY08 to FFY09	State EI/ILP will review the target for this indicator with the ICC and provider organization to identify potential strategies of improvement or to review the appropriateness of the target	Review postponed by ICC until FFY09
This is a new strategy for FFY 09	Alaska Part C will pilot statewide universal screening	New improvement activity added to address slippage in this target.

**Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY08****Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:**

This overview process is the same as described for Indicator 1.

**Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find**

**Indicator 7:** Percent of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting were conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

**Measurement:**

Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting was conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline) divided by the (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs evaluated and assessed for whom an initial IFSP meeting was required to be conducted)] times 100.

**Applied:**

602 eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting was conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline

647 of infants and toddlers with IFSPs evaluated and assessed for whom an initial IFSP meeting was required to be conducted

$602/647 \times 100 = 93.04\%$

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2008	100%

**Actual Target Data for FFY 2008: 93.04%**

This data

These data are collected through Alaska's Part C database and include all children for whom an evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting was required to be conducted in the state during the reporting period (FFY 2008). Data reported in previous APRs for this indicator were collected on a sample of children through cyclical onsite monitoring.

Alaska Part C included 83 children for whom the state identified the cause for delay as exceptional family circumstances documented in the child's record in both the numerator and denominator for this indicator.

Alaska Part C collected data on the number of days late and delay reasons for each child for whom an evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting was not conducted within the 45-day timeline in its Part C database.



Tables of Range of Days Late (excludes family delays):

<b>FY 09 45 Children</b>	Number of children	Percent of children
1 to 7 Days	20	44.4%
8 to 30 Days	20	44.4%
31 to 90 Days	4	8.9%
Unable to calculate due to missing referral data	1	2.2%
<b>FY 09 Total</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Correction of Noncompliance with Indicator 7:**

<b>Year</b>	<b>Number of Findings Made</b>	<b>Number of Findings Timely Corrected (within 12 months)</b>	<b>Number of Findings Subsequently Corrected</b>	<b>Number of Remaining Findings</b>
<b>FFY 2006</b>	4	3	0	1
<b>FFY 2007</b>	4	4	NA	0
<b>FFY 2008</b>	4	To be reported in the FFY09 APR	To be reported in the FFY09 APR	To be reported in the FFY09 APR

Alaska Part C identified noncompliance in FFY 2006 and FFY 2007 through cyclical onsite monitoring. For FFY 2008 and beyond, Alaska Part C will report on findings identified through analysis of census data collected by its Part C database.

As reported in the FFY 2007 APR, one finding of noncompliance made in FFY 2006 remained uncorrected. Alaska Part C imposed sanctions on the one EIS program with uncorrected noncompliance including required technical assistance, monthly reporting and additional onsite monitoring to conduct a root cause analysis and identify noncompliance with related requirements. While this agency has not fully corrected, the impact of state technical assistance demonstrates subsequent correction to 97% for this agency in FFY08. Alaska State Part C staff believes this agency has implemented appropriate policies and procedures to achieve 100% compliance with indicator 7 in FFY09.

Consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02, Alaska Part C verified that each EIS program identified in FFY 2006 and FFY 2007 corrected noncompliance by reviewing data demonstrating that the program was correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements. Alaska Part C verified this through reviewing data from its Part C database showing that each EIS program conducted an evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP within Part C's 45-day timeline for 100% of children for at least one quarter following the implementation of a corrective action plan.

In addition, using child-level data in its Part C database, Alaska Part C state staff verified that an evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting was conducted for each child, although late unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of Alaska Part C, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.

**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY08:**

Alaska demonstrates improvement for indicator 7 at 93.04% in FFY 2008 compared to 84% in FFY 2007. This improvement can be attributed to the extensive technical assistance, database training and development of database reports which enable local EIS staff to track upcoming due dates such as initial IFSP meetings.

Alaska completed the following (SPP) improvement activities in FFY08:

- State EI/ILP program implement changes or strategies identified by task force to enhance both recruitment and retention or distance delivery methodology.
- State EI/ILP program conducted a feasibility study on tele-health technology opportunities and completed a Speech Language Therapy pilot to improve indicator 1 (timely services) and 7 (45 day timeline). Tele-health service expansion is being explored in FFY09.
- State EI/ILP program continued to provide a forum for innovative local programs to share methods and strategies with all local programs on strategies used to meet 45 day timeline during the annual EIS Coordinator Conference and monthly EIS Coordinator teleconferences.
- State EI/ILP program staff provided technical assistance and training to local EIS programs specifically related to improvement strategies for meeting the 45 day timeline. Corrective action plans included requirements for indicator 7 improvement for all local EIS programs below 100%.

Indicator 7 Progress Table					
<i>Measurable and Rigorous Target 2008-2009</i>	Baseline FFY04 2004-2005	Actual Data FFY05 2005-2006	Actual Data FFY06 2006-2007	Actual Data FFY07 2007-2008	Actual Data FFY08 2008-2009
100%	<b>71%</b>	<b>88%</b>	<b>85.5%</b>	<b>84%</b>	<b>93.04%</b>

Note: Alaska Part C identified noncompliance in FFY 2006 and FFY 2007 through cyclical onsite monitoring. For FFY 2008, Alaska Part C reflects findings identified through analysis of census data collected by its Part C database.

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY09:** There are no changes to this indicator measurement, improvement activities, timelines, or resources.

**Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY08****Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:**

This overview process is the same as described for Indicator 1.

**Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Effective Transition**

**Indicator 8:** Percent of all children exiting Part C who received timely transition planning to support the child's transition to preschool and other appropriate community services by their third birthday including:

- A. IFSPs with transition steps and services;
- B. Notification to LEA, if child potentially eligible for Part B; and
- C. Transition conference, if child potentially eligible for Part B.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

**Measurement:**

- A. Percent = [(# of children exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services) divided by the (# of children exiting Part C)] times 100.
- B. Percent = [(# of children exiting Part C and potentially eligible for Part B where notification to the LEA occurred) divided by the (# of children exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B)] times 100.
- C. Percent = [(# of children exiting Part C and potentially eligible for Part B where the transition conference occurred) divided by the (# of children exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B)] times 100.

**Applied:**

- A. 374 children exiting Part C who had an IFSP with transition steps and services  
377 children exiting Part C  
 $374/377 \times 100 = 99.20\%$
- B. 376 children exiting Part C and potentially eligible for Part B where notification to the LEA occurred  
376 children exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B  
 $376/376 \times 100 = 100.00\%$
- C. 355 children exiting Part C and potentially eligible for Part B where the transition conference occurred  
377 children exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B  
 $355/377 \times 100 = 94.16\%$

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2008	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A. IFSPs with transition steps and services <b>100%</b></li> <li>B. Notification to LEA, if child potentially eligible for Part B; <b>100%</b></li> <li>C. Transition conference, if child potentially eligible for Part B <b>100%</b></li> </ul>

# APR Template – Part C (4)

Alaska  
State

## Actual Target Data for FFY 2008:

A. 99.20%

B. 100.00%

C. 94.16%

These data are collected through Alaska's Part C database and include all children who transitioned during the reporting period (FFY 2008). Data reported in previous APRs for this indicator were collected on a sample of children through cyclical onsite monitoring.

For Indicator 8B, Alaska did not include one child in either the numerator or the denominator due to parent opt-out, per Alaska's opt-out policy as approved by OSEP.

For Indicator 8C, Alaska Part C included 82 children for whom the state identified the cause for delay as exceptional family circumstances (as documented in the child's record) in both the numerator and denominator.

Alaska Part C collected data on the number of days late and delay reasons for each child potentially eligible for Part B for whom a transition conference was not held within the required timeline. All children with late transition conferences had transition conferences by their third birthday. Ten of the 22 children with late transition conferences had conferences held by their 34<sup>th</sup> month of age (10/22 = 45.5%).

### 8C. Table of Range of Days Late (exclude family delays)

FY 09 22 Children	Number of children	Percent of children
1 to 7 Days	1	4.5%
8 to 30 Days	4	18.1%
31 to 90 Days	16	72.7%
Missing transition meeting data	1	4.5%
FY 09 Total	22	100%

### Correction of Noncompliance with Indicator 8:

	Year	Number of Findings Made	Number of Findings Timely Corrected (within 12 months)	Number of Findings Subsequently Corrected	Number of Remaining Findings
8A	FFY 2006	2	1	1	0
	FFY 2007	3	3	NA	0
	FFY 2008	6	To be reported in the FFY09 APR	To be reported in the FFY09 APR	To be reported in the FFY09 APR
8B	FFY 2006	1	1	NA	0
	FFY 2007	0	0	NA	0
	FFY 2008	0	To be reported in the FFY09 APR	To be reported in the FFY09 APR	To be reported in the FFY09 APR
8C	FFY 2006	2	1	1	0

## APR Template – Part C (4)

Alaska

State

	<b>FFY 2007</b>	1	1	NA	0
	<b>FFY 2008</b>	5	To be reported in the FFY09 APR	To be reported in the FFY09 APR	To be reported in the FFY09 APR

Alaska Part C identified noncompliance in FFY 2006 and FFY 2007 through cyclical onsite monitoring. For FFY 2008 and beyond, Alaska Part C will report on findings identified through analysis of census data collected by its Part C database.

As reported in the FFY 2007 APR, one finding of noncompliance made in FFY 2006 remained uncorrected for both 8A and 8C. Alaska Part C imposed sanctions on the one EIS program with uncorrected noncompliance including required technical assistance, monthly reporting and additional onsite monitoring to conduct a root cause analysis and identify noncompliance with related requirements. The EIS program subsequently demonstrated 100% correction of the noncompliance with both Indicator 8A and 8C.

Consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02, Alaska Part C verified that each EIS program identified in FFY 2006 and FFY 2007 corrected noncompliance by reviewing data demonstrating that the program was correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements. Alaska Part C verified this through reviewing data from its Part C database showing that 100% of children exiting Part C received the required transition planning for at least one quarter following the implementation of a corrective action plan.

In addition, using child-level data in its Part C database, Alaska Part C state staff verified that:

- For Indicator 8A, the EIS program had developed an IFSP with transition steps and services unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of Alaska Part C and
- For Indicator 8C, the EIS program had conducted a transition conference for each child potentially eligible for Part B, although late; unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of Alaska Part C, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.

### **Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY08:**

Alaska demonstrates progress in all areas of indicator 8 with the exception of 8c Timely Transition meetings. Two agencies reported difficulty with timely transition meetings (indicator 8c) at the beginning of FFY08 due to 1) provider practice and 2) unexpected remote travel delays. Both EIS agencies implemented changes demonstrating improvement with this indicator: 1) identifying a central EIS agency position to track and coordinate all upcoming transition meetings and 2). scheduling transition meetings held in remote village communities earlier than required allowing for unexpected travel delays. All EIS agencies received additional transition meeting training. New data management reports were created to provide upcoming transition due dates and local EIS provider reminder calendars.

Alaska completed the following (SPP) improvement activities in FFY08:

#### **For Part A:**

Local EIS Program data review was a grant requirement and state EI/ILP staff provided oversight to local programs via Alaska Part C monitoring system. Data was used to improve the effectiveness of transition.

The EI/ILP program highlighted program strategies related to successful transitions during monthly teleconferences, the annual EIS Coordinator meeting and ongoing technical assistance to ensure service delivery and data consistency.

Local EIS programs were required to submit improvement plans based on yearly or monitor data. Corrective action plans included transition planning for local EIS programs below 100%.

#### **For Part B:**

Data review by programs was an expectation and state EI/ILP staff provided data review and oversight to ensure data completeness and accuracy. There was grant requirement that local EIS programs use quarterly and year end data to improve the effectiveness of transition.

The EI/ILP program highlighted program strategies related to successful transitions during monthly teleconferences, the annual EIS Coordinator meeting and ongoing technical assistance to ensure service delivery and data consistency.

EI/ILP continued to collaborate with automated notification per the Department of Education and Early Development and EI/ILP MOA.

#### For Part C:

Local EIS Program data review was a grant requirement and state EI/ILP staff provided oversight to local programs via Alaska Part C monitoring system. Data was used to improve the effectiveness of transition.

The EI/ILP program highlighted program strategies related to successful transitions during monthly teleconferences, the annual EIS Coordinator meeting and ongoing technical assistance to ensure service delivery and data consistency.

Local EIS programs were required to submit improvement plans based on yearly or monitor data. Corrective action plans included timely transition meetings for local EIS programs below 100%.

Indicator 8 Progress Table					
<i>Measurable and Rigorous Target 2008-2009</i>	Baseline FFY04 2004-2005	Actual Data FFY05 2005-2006	Actual Data FFY06 2006-2007	Actual Data FFY07 2007-2008	Actual Data FFY08 2008-2009
Indicator 8a 100%	95%	94%	88%	83%	99.20%
Indicator 8b 100%	95%	86%	80%	100%	100%
Indicator 8c 100%	95%	85%	83%	96%	94.16%

Note: Alaska Part C identified noncompliance in FFY 2006 and FFY 2007 through cyclical onsite monitoring. For FFY 2008, Alaska Part C reflects findings identified through analysis of census data collected by its Part C database.

#### Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2009:

Changes to the Alaska SPP 2009 Indicator 8 improvement activities:

Original SPP Improvement Activity	Proposed Improvement Activity Change	Justification for Improvement Activity Change
8b - Data review by programs will be an expectation and state EI/ILP staff will continue to provide review and oversight of quarterly and yearly data. There will be an expectation that programs use quarterly and year end data to	Notification data will be reviewed monthly by Alaska Part C Data Manager for accuracy. Alaska Part C Data Manager will provide oversight of the automated notification system to ensure complete and accurate data transmission to Part B.	Alaska Part C implemented automated notification through the Part C data system to Part C in FFY07.

## APR Template – Part C (4)

Alaska

State

improve the effectiveness of transition.		
--	--	--

**Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY08****Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:**

This overview process is the same as described for Indicator 1.

**Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision**

**Indicator 9:** General supervision system (including monitoring, complaints, hearings, etc.) identifies and corrects noncompliance as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

**Measurement:**

Percent of noncompliance corrected within one year of identification:

- a. # of findings of noncompliance.
- b. # of corrections completed as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.

Percent = [(b) divided by (a)] times 100.

States are required to use the "Indicator 9 Worksheet" to report data for this indicator (see Attachment A).

**Applied:**

53 findings of noncompliance

41 corrections completed as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification

$41/53 \times 100 = 77.36\%$

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2008	100%

**Actual Target Data for FFY 2008: 77.36%**



## INDICATOR C-9 WORKSHEET

Indicator/Indicator Clusters	General Supervision System Components	# of EIS Programs Issued Findings in FFY 2007 (7/1/07 through 6/30/08)	(a) # of Findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 (7/1/07 through 6/30/08)	(b) # of Findings of noncompliance from (a) for which correction was verified no later than one year from identification
1. * Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	8	8	8
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	0	0	Na
2. Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	3	4	4
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	0	0	Na
3. Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who demonstrate improved outcomes	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	0	0	Na
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	0	0	Na
4. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	0	0	Na
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	0	0	Na

# APR Template – Part C (4)

Alaska  
State

Indicator/Indicator Clusters	General Supervision System Components	# of EIS Programs Issued Findings in FFY 2007 (7/1/07 through 6/30/08)	(a) # of Findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 (7/1/07 through 6/30/08)	(b) # of Findings of noncompliance from (a) for which correction was verified no later than one year from identification
5. Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other  Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	0	0	Na
6. Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs		0	0	Na
7. *Percent of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting were conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline.	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	12	12	11
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	0	0	Na
8. *Percent of all children exiting Part C who received timely transition planning to support the child's transition to preschool and other appropriate community services by their third birthday including: A. IFSPs with transition steps and services;	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	7	7	6
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	0	0	Na
8. Percent of all children exiting Part C who received timely transition planning to support the child's transition to preschool and other appropriate community services by their third birthday including: B. Notification to LEA, if child potentially eligible for Part B; and	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	0	0	Na
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	0	0	Na

# APR Template – Part C (4)

Alaska  
State

Indicator/Indicator Clusters	General Supervision System Components	# of EIS Programs Issued Findings in FFY 2007 (7/1/07 through 6/30/08)	(a) # of Findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 (7/1/07 through 6/30/08)	(b) # of Findings of noncompliance from (a) for which correction was verified no later than one year from identification
8. *Percent of all children exiting Part C who received timely transition planning to support the child's transition to preschool and other appropriate community services by their third birthday including: C. Transition conference, if child potentially eligible for Part B.	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	6	7	7
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	0	0	Na
14. Timely and Accurate Data Reporting	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	1	1	1
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	0	0	Na
OTHER AREAS OF NONCOMPLIANCE: Policies and Procedures of Prior Written Notice.	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	5	5	1
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	0	0	Na
OTHER AREAS OF NONCOMPLIANCE: Procedural Safeguards are provided in native language of the parents, unless clearly not feasible to do so.	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	1	1	1
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	0	0	Na

# APR Template – Part C (4)

Alaska  
State

Indicator/Indicator Clusters	General Supervision System Components	# of EIS Programs Issued Findings in FFY 2007 (7/1/07 through 6/30/08)	(a) # of Findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 (7/1/07 through 6/30/08)	(b) # of Findings of noncompliance from (a) for which correction was verified no later than one year from identification
OTHER AREAS OF NONCOMPLIANCE: Two or more disciplines are involved in provision of integrated and coordinated services including evaluation and assessment.	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	2	2	0
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	0	0	Na
OTHER AREAS OF NONCOMPLIANCE: IFSP outcomes reflect family priorities, concerns and resources.	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	3	3	1
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	0	0	Na
OTHER AREAS OF NONCOMPLIANCE: All services are provided as specified on the IFSP.	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	1	1	0
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	0	0	Na
OTHER AREAS OF NONCOMPLIANCE: Services and supports identified in the IFSP are designed to enhance the capacity of the family in meeting the developmental needs of their child.	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	1	1	1
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	0	0	Na

Indicator/Indicator Clusters	General Supervision System Components	# of EIS Programs Issued Findings in FFY 2007 (7/1/07 through 6/30/08)	(a) # of Findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 (7/1/07 through 6/30/08)	(b) # of Findings of noncompliance from (a) for which correction was verified no later than one year from identification
OTHER AREAS OF NONCOMPLIANCE: There is documentation that a family declined a family directed assessment.	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	1	1	0
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	0	0	NA
<b>Sum the numbers down Column a and Column b</b>			53	41

The findings in the worksheet include all noncompliance, including noncompliance with related requirements, identified by Alaska Part C during FFY 2007 through its monitoring system, including onsite monitoring, self-assessments, desk audits, and its statewide database. Alaska Part C identified initial FFY07 noncompliance through cyclical on-site monitoring. Full census data and new monitoring tools were piloted in FFY07 and FFY08 allowing Alaska Part C to identify addition FFY07 findings.

For all findings reported as corrected, Alaska Part C verified that the EIS program corrected noncompliance by reviewing data demonstrating that the program was correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements and components of the state's general supervision system (policies and procedures, use of funds, provision of training and technical assistance, change in supervision, and changes in provider practice). Alaska Part C verified this through reviewing data from its Part C database or onsite file reviews showing that each requirement was met for 100% of children for at least one quarter following the implementation of a corrective action plan.

In addition, using child-level data in its Part C database, Alaska Part C state staff verified that all individual instances of noncompliance were corrected, including that all evaluations, assessments, IFSPs, and services were provided, although late, unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of Alaska Part C, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.

#### **Describe the process for selecting EIS programs for Monitoring:**

Data reported in previous APRs for this indicator were reported based on findings made by reviewing a sample of children's files through cyclical onsite monitoring. The agencies reported for indicator 9 were selected through Alaska's three-year cyclical onsite monitoring process and received state follow-up in FFY08 based on findings and corrective action plans. Alaska implemented its new monitoring system in fourth quarter FFY07 and now monitors all agencies each year through the data system. The FFY 2007 findings listed above include findings made through cyclical monitoring (including self-assessment) and through the statewide database.

**Correction of FFY 2007 Findings of Noncompliance Timely Corrected (corrected within one year from identification of the noncompliance):**

1. Number of findings of noncompliance the State made during FFY 2007 (the period from July 1, 2007 through June 30, 2008) (Sum of Column a on the Indicator C 9 Worksheet)	<b>53</b>
2. Number of findings the State verified as timely corrected (corrected within one year from the date of notification to the EIS programs of the finding) (Sum of Column b on the Indicator C 9 Worksheet)	<b>41</b>
3. Number of findings <u>not</u> verified as corrected within one year [(1) minus (2)]	<b>12</b>

**Correction of FFY 2007 Findings of Noncompliance Not Timely Corrected (corrected more than one year from identification of the noncompliance):**

4. Number of FFY 2007 findings not timely corrected (same as the number from (3) above)	<b>12</b>
5. Number of findings the State has verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline ("subsequent correction")	<b>11</b>
6. Number of findings <u>not</u> yet verified as corrected [(4) minus (5)]	<b>1</b>

11 of 12 FFY07 APR uncorrected findings of noncompliance have been subsequently corrected to 100%. The following related area of noncompliance (noted as "Other Areas of Noncompliance" in the table above) is in longstanding noncompliance status:

- Prior Written Notice – one EIS agency is in the process of completing their agency policy and procedure revision at the time of this report. It is expected that this agency will achieve 100% subsequent correction.

With subsequent correction, FFY08 Indicator 9 is currently at 98.11% (52/53)

**Actions Taken if Noncompliance Not Corrected**

The one EIS agency in longstanding noncompliance status for the related area of noncompliance: Prior Written Notice, received sanctions including technical assistance, additional onsite monitoring to conduct a root cause analysis and follow up onsite verification for correction. This agency is in the process of completing a policy and procedure revision at the time of this report. Follow-up documentation is required to verify implementation of the new policy and procedure.

**Verification of Correction (either timely or subsequent)**

For those findings with reported correction, Alaska Part C conducted onsite verification visits and utilized the statewide data system to examine correction each quarter at the child level. The new Alaska Part C monitoring system has improved timely correction and assures that findings with regulatory citations are made each quarter; a plan of correction is then required by the local EIS agency and is reviewed by state Part C staff to ensure that correction: 1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements: (EIS agencies have implemented the regulation at 100% for no less than one quarter); and 2) has corrected all instances of noncompliance (including noncompliance identified through the State's monitoring system, through the data system and by the Department) within 12 months of the finding, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02. The implementation of this verification for specific indicators is described in each of the compliance indicators of this APR.

## APR Template – Part C (4)

Alaska  
State

### Correction of Remaining FFY 2006 Findings of Noncompliance:

If the State reported <100% for this indicator in its FFY 2006 APR and did not report that the remaining FFY 2006 findings were subsequently corrected, provide the information below:

1. Number of remaining FFY 2006 findings noted in OSEP's June 1, 2009 FFY 2007 APR response table for this indicator	4
2. Number of remaining FFY 2006 findings the State has verified as corrected	3
3. Number of remaining FFY 2006 findings the State has NOT verified as corrected [(1) minus (2)]	1

Alaska Part C reported in its FFY 2007 APR that 11 of 15 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 were timely corrected. The four remaining findings were made with one EIS program and, sanctions on that EIS program were imposed including:

- on-site training July – September 2009
  - Data base training,
  - Evidence-Based Practice in Early Intervention training,
  - Child Outcome Training, Alaska Transition Training Initiative staff training,
- monthly self assessment reporting,
- on-site monitoring July 2009 and December 2009 to conduct root cause analysis, identify noncompliance with related requirements and conduct corrective action plan review/revisions.

### Impact of Sanctions for Remaining FFY 2006 Finding of Noncompliance

Alaska Part C verified that the EIS program subsequently corrected the noncompliance with Indicators: 1, 8a, and 8c at 100%. For the remaining finding, Alaska Part C continues to impose the above sanctions.

While one agency has not fully corrected indicator 7, the impact of state technical assistance demonstrates subsequent correction to 97% (indicator 7) for this agency in FFY08. Alaska State Part C staff believes this agency has implemented appropriate policies and procedures to achieve 100% compliance with indicator 7 in FFY09.

### Additional Information Required by the OSEP APR Response Table:

Statement from the Response Table	State's Response
In reporting on Indicator 9 in the FFY 2008 APR, the State must use the Indicator 9 worksheet	Alaska includes the Indicator 9 worksheet in this FFY 2008 APR

### Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY08:

Indicator 9 demonstrates slippage in FFY08 at 77.36% compared to FFY07 at 80%. Alaska Part C identified noncompliance in FFY 2006 and FFY 2007 through cyclical onsite monitoring. For FFY 2008 and beyond, Alaska Part C reports findings and correction of findings identified through analysis of annual census data collected by its Part C database. Alaska Part C's new focused monitoring system demonstrates an improvement of this indicator through subsequent correction of non-compliance as noted above.

Alaska completed the following (SPP) improvement activities in FFY08:

- State EI/ILP clarified the process of findings with local EIS programs. Alaska previously required correction within 12 months of corrective action plan approval. Alaska now requires correction within 12 months of notification of the findings.
- State EI/ILP provided training and technical assistance regarding prior written notice requirements.
- Local EIS programs were expected to understand data trends and issues and respond to areas of non-compliance on an ongoing basis.
- State EI/ILP provided quarterly (monthly to local EIS programs with CAPs) feedback to local programs through data analysis, self-assessment information, quarterly and yearly narrative reports, and monitoring.
- Training materials such as a user manual, training videos and teleconferences were available to programs to support accurate use of the web-based system.
- The state EI/ILP program evaluated the use and efficacy of the web-based system on an ongoing basis through meetings, telephonic and electronic communication.

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY09:**

Changes to the Alaska SPP 2009 Indicator 9 improvement activities:

Original SPP Improvement Activity	Proposed Improvement Activity Change	Justification for Improvement Activity Change
State EI/ILP staff will provide consistent and frequent feedback to local programs through data analysis, self-assessment information, quarterly and yearly narrative reports, and on-site monitoring	State EI/ILP staff will provide monthly and quarterly feedback to local EIS programs through data analysis, self-assessment information, quarterly and yearly narrative reports, and monitoring Corrective Action Plan review	Corrective Action Plans align with Alaska's new focused monitoring system.
Data collected through a variety of accountability procedures such as desk audits, on-site monitoring, drill down exercises, self assessments and quarterly and annual reports will be used to inform practice and program development and improvement.	Data collected through a variety of accountability procedures such as desk audits, monitoring, drill down exercises, self assessments and quarterly and annual reports will be used to inform practice and program development and improvement.	Alaska incorporated a new focused monitoring system. This replaced the on-site monitoring, however, the new monitoring system may include on-site visits to examine root cause analysis.



**Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY08****Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:**

This overview process is the same as described for Indicator 1.

**Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision**

**Indicator 10:** Percent of signed written complaints with reports issued that were resolved within 60-day timeline or a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

**Measurement:** Percent =  $[(1.1(b) + 1.1(c)) \text{ divided by } 1.1] \text{ times } 100$ .

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2008	NA

**Actual Target Data for FFY08:** No target data available, no written complaints were made during FFY08.

**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY08:**

Alaska completed the following improvement activities in FFY08:

- Alaska EI/ILP formed a task group in 2008 to advise the Part C Coordinator on Alaska's child and family rights materials. This task group reviewed all existing Alaska materials, other state family rights resources, made suggestions for improving the format, accessibility and appeal. This informational material was designed and submitted for printing in FFY08. Statewide distribution is expected in FY09. These materials will also be posted on the Alaska statewide EI/ILP web site when complete.
- Training was conducted through the monitoring process and topical teleconferences and included parent procedural safeguards, how to file a complaint, etc. State EI/ILP staff completed an annual review of renewal rates of receipt of parent's rights through the self-assessment and the family outcomes survey.
- Alaska Part C collaborated with the Alaska Parent Training and Information Center through the Alaska Stone Soup Group to provide parents, educators and statewide partners special education support and training; including parent rights training.

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY09:**

There are no changes to this indicator measurement, improvement activities, timelines, or resources.

**Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY08****Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:**

This overview process is the same as described for Indicator 1.

**Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision**

**Indicator 11:** Percent of fully adjudicated due process hearing requests that were fully adjudicated within the applicable timeline.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

**Measurement:** Percent = [(3.2(a) + 3.2(b)) divided by 3.2] times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2008	NA

**Actual Target Data for FFY07:** No target data available, no due process hearing requests were made during FFY08.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY08: Alaska completed the following improvement activities in FFY08:

- Training continued through the FFY08 monitoring process to ensure that parents understand procedures for filing complaints and full due process.
- Local EI/ILP agencies provided annual review of parent's rights through the local agency self-assessment. This assessment asks reviewers to document parent receipt of rights and review of materials with each enrolled family. Results of this assessment demonstrate all families are reviewing child and family rights at intake.

See discussion of activities for indicator #10 for explanation of the Alaska EI/ILP due process procedures and update of these materials. The State EI staff will continue to work with the state Parent Training Initiative grant in FFY09 to ensure effective dissemination of parent trainings.

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY09:**

There are no changes to this indicator measurement, improvement activities, timelines, or resources.

**Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY08****Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:**

This overview process is the same as described for Indicator 1.

**Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision**

**Indicator 12:** Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements (applicable if Part B due process procedures are adopted).

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

**Measurement:** Percent = (3.1(a) divided by 3.1) times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2008	NA

**Actual Target Data for FFY08:** No target data available, no hearing requests were received.

**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY08:** Not applicable

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY09:**

There are no changes to this indicator measurement, improvement activities, timelines, or resources.

**Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY08****Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:**

This overview process is the same as described for Indicator 1.

**Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision**

**Indicator 13:** Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

**Measurement:** Percent = [(2.1(a)(i) + 2.1(b)(i)) divided by 2.1] times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2008	NA

**Actual Target Data for FFY08:** No target data available, no mediation requests received.

**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY08:** Refer to previous description in indicator #10.

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY09:**

There are no changes to this indicator measurement, improvement activities, timelines, or resources.

**Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY08****Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:**

This overview process is the same as described for Indicator 1.

**Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision**

**Indicator 14:** State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

**Measurement:** State reported data, including 618 data, State performance plan, and annual performance reports, are:

- a. Submitted on or before due dates (February 1 for child count and settings and November 1 for exiting and dispute resolution); and
- b. Accurate, including covering the correct year and following the correct measurement.

States are required to use the "Indicator 14 Data Rubric" for reporting data for this indicator (see Attachment B).

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2008	100%

**Actual Target Data for FFY 2008:**

95.6%

SPP/APR Data - Indicator 14			
APR Indicator	Valid and Reliable	Correct Calculation	Total
1	1	1	2
2	1	1	2
3	1	1	2
4	1	1	2
5	1	1	2
6	1	1	2
7	1	1	2
8a	1	1	2
8b	1	1	2
8c	1	1	2
9	1	1	2
10	1	1	2
11	1	1	2
12	1	1	2
13	1	1	2

# APR Template – Part C (4)

Alaska  
State

	<b>Subtotal</b>	30
<b>APR Score Calculation</b>	<b>Timely Submission Points</b> - If the FFY 2008 APR was submitted on-time, place the number 5 in the cell on the right.	5
	<b>Grand Total</b> - (Sum of subtotal and Timely Submission Points) =	35

618 Data - Indicator 14					
Table	Timely	Complete Data	Passed Edit Check	Responded to Data Note Requests	Total
Table 1 - Child Count Due Date: 2/1/09	1	1	1	1	4
Table 2 - Program Settings Due Date: 2/1/09	1	1	0	1	3
Table 3 - Exiting Due Date: 11/1/09	1	1	0	NA	2
Table 4 - Dispute Resolution Due Date: 11/1/09	1	1	1	N/A	3
				<b>Subtotal</b>	12
<b>618 Score Calculation</b>			<b>Grand Total</b> (Subtotal X 2.5) =		30

Indicator #14 Calculation	
A. APR Grand Total	35.00
B. 618 Grand Total	30
C. APR Grand Total (A) + 618 Grand Total (B) =	65
Total NA in APR	0.00
Total NA in 618	2.00
<b>Base</b>	<b>68.00</b>
D. Subtotal (C divided by Base*) =	0.956
E. Indicator Score (Subtotal D x 100) =	95.6

Alaska demonstrated slippage from 100% to 95.6% for indicator 14 in FFY08.

While Alaska received confirmation of timely and accurate 618 reporting for tables 1 and 2 on March 9, 2009, it was later brought to the Part C Data Manager's attention that program settings did not load successfully. Alaska subsequently found a formula error in a new database child count report for redistributing "unknown race". This new automated report was corrected in Alaska's Part C database and the settings tables resubmitted with a successful reload into DANS.

All automated Child Count database reports have been reviewed for accuracy by the Data Manager and IT staff. Modifications were implemented and tested to assure accurate reporting. All 618 data reports are now reviewed by both the Part C Data Manager and Senior Database Programmer. Alaska Part C has taken the following additional steps to ensure improvement and maintained indicator 14 compliance:

1. Ensuring Valid, Accurate and Timely Data:

Data gathered through our enhanced accountability system and monitoring was used to inform and drive decisions related to resource allocation, need for technical assistance, and assigned monitoring. The Alaska web database incorporates data editing procedures to verify accurate and complete data, for example, date of birth values yield child age less than 3 years, if not, the end-user is alerted to an error in the date. Reportable data is validated with dropdown lists and required fields.

Each local EIS program reviews their data quarterly for completeness and accuracy using the automated data compliance, reminders and data confirmation reports. Data that is missing or inaccurate is flagged on these reports and allows end-users to drill down into each child record for examination and/or correction prior to verification.

The Alaska web database tracks the receipt of timely local EIS data verification. The Part C Data Manager tracks email requests for verification extensions (late data verification). Each State Program Specialist reviews requests for extensions and either approves or disapproves these requests. If more than one agency is having difficulties with the database or the required verification report, the Part C Data Manager notifies the database programmer(s) and requests support for database maintenance. An email regarding database improvements/fixes is then sent out to local EIS programs and posted to the web database forum.

Upon receipt of verification, an automated email is sent to the State Program Specialists and Part C Data Manager that a local EIS agency has verified their quarterly data. Program Specialists reviews annual trend data for each compliance indicator, noting increases or decreases in trend data and non-compliance. Each agency with non-compliance is required to submit a plan of correction per indicator at the time of verification. Verification and corrective action plans are then reviewed for approval by the Program Specialists within 30 days of receipt. Verification, plans of correction and approvals are tracked through the database and reviewed for APR preparation and local determinations annually. Alaska uses year-to-year comparisons and trend lines as a reliability check for annually reported data (both to OSEP and for public reporting).

2. Validity and Validation

Providers and local agency staff have the first level of responsibility for submitting accurate data. Alaska policies and procedures have been implemented that assist, incentivize, reward, review, correct and ensure timely and accurate data submittals. Local agency staff is required to run reports that assist in summarizing compliance measures and finding discrepancies. Regular statewide teleconferences are held with local agencies to review

statewide aggregate data. Comparing compliance results provides incentive to improve results.

All data reports follow OSEP measurement guidance. State Part C staff, programmers and local EIS agencies scrutinize business rules for each compliance indicator. Rigorous testing procedures are followed for new and revised data reports.

State monitoring teams review local EIS policies and procedures to ensure that data collection and entry is consistent with State of Alaska Part C requirements and guidelines. On-site file reviews compare database information with child file. Annual self-assessment procedures require local EIS file reviews of child records to ensure accurate data entry.

Database Training is provided to all new direct service and data personnel across the state. Training focuses on accurate data entry, definitions, reporting and data management.

Follow-up and ongoing training information is provided through monthly database teleconference (open to all users) and a database forum.

**Additional Information Required by the OSEP APR Response Table:**

Statement from the Response Table	State's Response
In reporting on Indicator 14 in the FFY 2008 APR, the State must use the Indicator 14 Data Rubric	Alaska includes the Indicator 14 Data Rubric in this FFY 2008 APR

**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2008:**

Alaska completed the following (SPP) improvement activities in FFY08:

- Quarterly data verification reports were required from local EIS programs to ensure data accuracy. Technical assistance was provided to monitor accuracy of data. Web database training was provided for each new staff. Additionally, a web training module and new data management reports were utilized by local EIS staff. Monthly database teleconferences were held and an on-line database forum maintained to assist local programs with accurate and timely data entry.
- Local EIS grants required timely and accurate data verification.
- Child Count report deadlines have been revised at the state level to ensure early and accurate reporting prior to deadlines.

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2009:** Changes to the Alaska SPP 2009 Indicator 14 improvement activities:

Addition of FFY 2009 SPP Improvement Activity	Justification for Improvement Activity Change
618 data reports are reviewed by both the Part C Data Manager and Senior Database Programmer with revised state level reporting deadlines to ensure early and accurate reporting prior to DAC deadlines.	To ensure accuracy and timeliness of indicator.